Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/751,327	FARABOSCHI ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Richard Ellis	2183
All Participants:	Status of Application:	
(1) <u>Richard Ellis</u> .	(3)	
(2) Holly Rudnick (reg. no. 43,065).	(4)	
Date of Interview: <u>14 July 2004</u>	Time: <u>n/a</u>	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Appl Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:	licant's representative)	
Part I.	,	
Rejection(s) discussed:		·
Claims discussed: 21	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	
Prior art documents discussed: None		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GEN See Continuation Sheet	NERAL NATURE OF WHAT \	WAS DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
 ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate directly resulted in the allowance of the application of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summer 	The examiner will provide a vote record of the substance of	written summary of the substance the interview, since the interview
		·
Parant II	N/A	
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Application	ant/Applicant's Representativ	e Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Applicant was contacted about a typographical error in new claim 21. In the last line of claim 21, the word "discuss" was used in the claim, when it appears that applicant intended to present the word --dismiss--. Applicant indicated that the Examiner was correct, the claim should have used the word --dismiss--. Applicant agreed to the attached examiner's amendment correcting the claim.